



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1430
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/868,375	06/18/2001	Anton Oguzhan Alford Andrews	PHN-17.707	8890

24737 7590 04/06/2006

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

VU, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/868,375	Applicant(s) ANDREWS ET AL.	
	Examiner Thanh T. Vu	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 35-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 35-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 01/18/2006

Claims 35-61 are pending in this application. In the Amendment, claims 1-34 were cancelled, and claims 35-61 were added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 54 recites the limitation "the frequency". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 42, 49, 50, 54, 60, 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621).

Per claim 42, Nawaz teaches an information processing device for exploring information by a user, comprising: a display screen to display a plurality of flowing links within a flow zone, each of the flowing links being linked to respective information units for display in a presentation zone of the display screen (fig. 3; col. 8, lines 34-44); and an input device responsive to control by the user to directly alter the flow of the links and to select one of the flowing links (col. 8, lines 44-47; col. 9, lines 20-24).

Per claim 49, Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, further comprising: a filtering unit including a plurality of user selectable filters for controlling the flow zone to display links to information units which meet a requirement imposed by a selected filter (col. 9, lines 37-54).

Per claim 50, Nawaz teaches teaches an information processing device according to claim 49, wherein the filtering unit adapts the selected filter to display links to information units similar to the related information unit (col. 9, lines 37-54).

Per claim 54, Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 51, wherein the frequency of display of an information unit in the flow zone is determined by its age and/or popularity (col. 9, lines 37-54; col. 8, lines 62-57; since the data items are being displayed in rotation one after another, the users can set how often they want to see a data item by choosing more or less number of content providers to source the data items).

Claims 60 and 61 individually are rejected under the same rationale as claim 42.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 35, 57, 58, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621) and Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767).

Per claim 35, Nawaz teaches a graphical user interface for use with a data processing device, comprising:

a plurality of user responsive display elements for displaying on the screen, the elements comprising: a flow zone comprising a list of flowing links displayed around a periphery of the screen, (fig. 3; col. 8, lines 34-47) wherein the user making selection on the screen to induce change in the movement of the flowing links (col. 8, lines 44-47);

a presentation zone for presenting information selected from the flowing links (col. 9, lines 22-24; figs. 10 and 11).

Nawaz does not specifically teach a horizontally disposed touch screen for interaction with a user. However, Ku teaches a horizontally disposed touch screen for interaction with a user (fig. 6; col. 5, lines 1-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Ku in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide a user with a display that can be conveniently adjusted to a variety of positions.

Per claim 57, and 58, Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, but does not teach wherein the display screen and the input device are embodied as part of a portable device, and wherein the portable device is a hand-held device. However, Ku teaches

Art Unit: 2174

wherein the display screen and the input device are embodied as part of a portable device, and wherein the portable device is a hand-held device (see abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Ku in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide a user with a display that can be conveniently adjusted to a variety of positions.

Claim 59 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 35.

Claims 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767), and Straub et al. ("Straub", U.S. Pat. No. 6,216,141).

Per claim 36 and 37, the modified Nawaz teaches the interface of claim 35, but does not teach the display elements further comprise at least one flow control element, a respective flow control element being disposed adjacent to each flowing link, and a plurality of control zones disposed together for effecting control of other display elements. However, Straub teaches the display elements further comprise at least one flow control element, a respective flow control element being disposed adjacent to each flowing link (col. 9, lines 24-32), and a plurality of control zones disposed together for effecting control of other display elements (fig. 5; controls 162, 164; col. 9, lines 7-8, and lines 24-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the flow control means as taught by Straub in the modified Nawaz because it provides users different navigation control options to look through the information in the viewer.

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767), Straub et al. ("Straub", U.S. Pat. No. 6,216,141) and Sidana (U.S. Pat. No. 6,081,829).

Per claim 38, the modified Nawaz teaches the interface of claim 37, wherein the control zones comprise: an agent zone for selecting filtering agents for filtering contents of the flow zone, a mode zone for altering a format of other zones (fig. 3; option 160; col. 9, lines 37-42), but does not teach an annotation zone for annotating information in the presentation zone. However, Sidana teaches an annotation zone for annotating information in the presentation zone (col. 2, lines 23-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Sidana in the invention of the modified Nawaz in order to enable a user to store custom information (such as user comments) associated with a web document.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767), Bates et al. ("Bates", U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,350), and Barraus et al. ("Barraus", U.S. Pat. No. 6,693,652).

Per claim 39, the modified Nawaz teaches the interface of claim 35, but do not teach the interface further comprising at least one token zone for displaying personal links wherein the personal links may be dragged to other zones to affect what is displayed in the other zones. However, Bates teaches an interface comprising at least one token zone for displaying personal links (fig. 14, col. 3, line 59-col. 4, line 6). Barraus teaches links may be dragged to other zones to affect what is displayed in the other zones (fig. 15; col. 25, line 55-col. 26, line 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

Art Unit: 2174

include the teachings of Bates and Barraus in the invention of the modified Nawaz in order to provide user with an improved manner for creating bookmarks and organizing and presenting such bookmark, and in order to automatically generate a thumbnail image of a web page.

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767), Bates et al. ("Bates", U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,350), Barraus et al. ("Barraus", U.S. Pat. No. 6,693,652), and Selker (U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,098).

Per claim 40, the modified Nawaz teaches the interface of claim 39, but does not teach wherein the token zone is in the form of carousel. However, Selker teaches wherein the token zone is in the form of carousel (fig. 4 and 7; col. 1, lines 51-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Selker in the invention of the modified Nawaz in order to provide in improve method for presenting a list of information to a user.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767), and Flutka et al. ("Flutka", U.S. Pat. No. 5,758,934).

Per claim 41, the modified Nawaz teaches the user interface of claim 35, but does not teach a table comprising the user interface and adapted for a respective user to sit adjacent to each personal selection zone. However Flutka teaches a table comprising the user interface and adapted for a respective user to sit adjacent to each personal selection zone. (fig. 1; see Abstract;

Art Unit: 2174

col. 2, lines 45-51; it is noted that the user may place the device on top of the desk also).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a screen adapted for use in a horizontal plane as taught by Flutka in the invention of modified Nawaz in order to improve the health of the computer operator and to provide for an unimpeded forward line of sight by the computer operator.

Claims 43, 44 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), and Straub et al. ("Straub", U.S. Pat. No. 6,216,141).

Per claim 43, Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, wherein the flowing links move at a default flow speed and a default flow direction within the flow zone, and the input device is controlled by the user to selectably change the flow speed or flow direction (col. 8, lines 44-54), but does not teach the input device is controlled by the user to selectably change flow direction. However, Straub teaches the input device is controlled by the user to selectably change flow direction (fig. 5; controls 162, 164; col. 9, lines 7-8, and lines 24-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the flow control means as taught by Straub in the invention of Nawaz because it provides users different navigation control options to look through the information in the viewer.

Per claim 44, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 43. Straub further teaches wherein the input device is a user operable point-and-select device for selecting a location within the flow zone, and flow of the flowing links within the flow

Art Unit: 2174

zone is stoppable in response to the user statically selecting a location within the flow zone with the user operable point-and-select device (fig. 5; controls 162, 164; col. 9, lines 7-8, and lines 24-32).

Per claim 47, the modified Nawaz an information processing device according to claim 43, and Straub further teaches wherein the flow zone is arranged to alternately display the links and flow control areas, and the flow is controlled by selecting the flow control areas with the input device (fig. 5; controls 162, 164; col. 9, lines 7-8, and lines 24-32).

Claims 45, 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), and Straub et al. ("Straub", U.S. Pat. No. 6,216,141), and Yamada et al. ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432)

Per claim 45 and 46, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 43, but does not teach wherein the flow speed changes in response to the user selecting a location of the display screen with the input device and dragging the selected location in the flow direction, and wherein the flow direction is reversed in response to the user selecting a location and dragging the selected location against the flow direction. However, Yamada teaches wherein the flow speed changes in response to the user selecting a location of the display screen with the input device and dragging the selected location in the flow direction, and wherein the flow direction is reversed in response to the user selecting a location and dragging the selected location against the flow direction (figs. 6 and 7; col. 18, lines 20-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the flow control means as taught by Yamada in the invention of Nawaz and Straub because it

Art Unit: 2174

provides users different navigation control options to control the direction and speed of the scrolling information.

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), and Barraus et al. ("Barraus", U.S. Pat. No. 6,693,652).

Per claim 48, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, but does not teach wherein the start of presentation of the content from the related information unit responds to the user dragging the selected link to the presentation zone. However, Barraus teaches the start of presentation of the content from the related information unit responds to the user dragging the selected link to the presentation zone (fig. 15; col. 25, line 55-col. 26, line 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of Barraus in the invention of the modified Nawaz in order to automatically generating a thumbnail image of a web page.

Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), and Bates et al. ("Bates", U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,350).

Per claim 51, Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, but does not teach a user-link unit to maintain a plurality of preferred user-links and display the user-links in a further zone. However, Bates teaches a user-link unit to maintain a plurality of preferred user-links and display the user-links in a further zone (fig. 14, col. 3, line 59-col. 4, line 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of Bates in the invention of the Nawaz in order to provide the user with an improved manner for creating bookmarks and organizing and presenting such bookmark.

Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), and Bates et al. ("Bates", U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,350), and Glaser (U.S. pat. No. 6,392,671).

Per claim 52, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 51, comprising the user-link unit for sorting and/or retrieving the preferred user-links (Bates; fig. 14, col. 3, line 59-col. 4, line 6), but does not teach further comprising: a detector for communicating with a user supplied data carrier in response to control by the user-link unit for retrieving the user personal preferences (col. 2, lines 38-45; col. 5, lines 27-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of Glaser in the invention of the modified Nawaz in order to automatically transport user preferences from one computer system to another computer system.

Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), and Bates et al. ("Bates", U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,350), and Glaser (U.S. pat. No. 6,392,671), and Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767).

Per claim 53, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 52, wherein the user supplied data carrier is a token that interact with a detector through placement (Glaser col. 2, lines 38-45; col. 5, lines 27-33), the modified Nawaz does not teach wherein the display screen is a table top touch screen. However, Ku teaches the display screen is a table top touch screen (fig. 6; col. 5, lines 1-6; since the portable computer of Ku is capable of being placed flatly on a horizontal surface such as on top of a desk, the examiner considers it to be a table top touch screen). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2174

the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Ku in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide a user with a display that can be conveniently adjusted to a variety of positions.

Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), and Flutka et al. ("Flutka", U.S. Pat. No. 5,758,934).

Per claim 55, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, but does not teach a table for supporting the display screen. However Flutka teaches a table for supporting the display screen (fig. 1; see Abstract; col. 2, lines 45-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a screen is adapted for use in a horizontal plane as taught by Flutka in the invention of Nawaz in order to improve the health of the computer operator and to provide for an unimpeded forward line of sight by the computer operator.

Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), and Naidoo (U.S. Pat. No. 6,629,136).

Per Claim 56, Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, but does not teach the respective information units for display on the display screen correspond to a location of the information processing device. However, Naidoo teaches the respective information units for display on the display screen correspond to a location of the information processing device (col. 2, lines 21-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a screen that is adapted for use in a horizontal plane as taught by Naidoo in the invention of Nawaz in order to automatically provide information content to the user based on location of the user's device.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the amendment have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Vu


KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100